United States District Court

for the

Eastern District of Missouri

United States of Amer	rica)	
v.)	
William Thomas) Case No:	4:07CR656 HEA
	0/2/2002) USM No:	34696-044
Date of Original Judgment: Date of Previous Amended Judgment:	9/3/2008) Las Lawley	22
Use Date of Last Amended Judgment if Any)		$\frac{\text{Lee Lawle}}{\text{Defendant's }}$	· · ·
		_ 0,0	
ORDER REGAR	DING MOTIO	N FOR SE	NTENCE REDUCTION
PU	RSUANT TO 1	18 U.S.C. § 3	3582(c)(2)
ubsequently been lowered and made in 994(u), and having considered such and the sentencing factors set forth in T IS ORDERED that the motion is:	retroactive by the Unmotion, and taking in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)	nited States Sen into account the i, to the extent the	
X DENIED. GRANTEI the last judgment issued) of		's previously im onths is reduce	posed sentence of imprisonment (as reflected in d to
·			
(C	omplete Parts I and II of	rage 2 when mone	on is granieu)
except as otherwise provided, all prov	visions of the judgma	ent dated	9/3/2008 shall remain in effect.
	isions of the juaging		Shall remain in exteen
T IS SO ORDERED.		/ (11	₩.
Order Date: 1/9/2012		X/e,V/	
		/ och se	Judge's signature
		/ ocy el	Judge's signature
Effective Date:		Henry I	Edward Autrey, U.S. District Judge
ffective Date: (if different from order da	te)	Henry I	Edward Autrey, U.S. District Judge Printed name and title

AO 247 (Rev. 11/11) Order Regarding Motion for Sentence Reduction Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) Page 2 of 2 (Page 2 Not for Public Disclosure)

This page contains information that should not be filed in court unless under seal. (Not for Public Disclosure)					
DEFENDANT: Thomas, William CASE NUMBER: 4:07CR656 HEA DISTRICT: Eastern District of Missouri					
I. COURT DETERMINATION OF GUIDELINE RANGE (Prior to Any Departures) Previous Total Offense Level: Criminal History Category: Previous Guideline Range: to to months Amended Guideline Range: to months	nths				
 II. SENTENCE RELATIVE TO THE AMENDED GUIDELINE RANGE The reduced sentence is within the amended guideline range. The previous term of imprisonment imposed was less than the guideline range applicable to the defendant at the time of sentencing as a result of a substantial assistance departure or Rule 35 reduction, and the reduced sentence is comparably less than the amended guideline range. The reduced sentence is above the amended guideline range. 					
III. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS					
As there is a mandatory minimum in this matter, the sentence reduction motion is denied.					